

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-12 and 15-24 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 3, 10-12, 15, 16, 23 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is noted with appreciation that the Office Action has allowed claims 5-8 and 17-20 and has indicated that claims 3 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and of any intervening claims. Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1, there being no intervening claims. Claims 2 and 9-12 have been amended to depend from claim 3. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 3 and its dependent claims 2, 4 and 9-12 are now allowable.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of base claim 13 and of intervening claim 14. Claims 16 and 21-23 have been amended to depend from claim 15. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 16 and 21-23 are also allowable.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 02000351499A to Karasawa, hereafter Karasawa.

It is submitted that this rejection is moot since claims 1, 13, 14 and 25 have been canceled and claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 16, 21 and 22 are now allowable for the reasons set forth above and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Karasawa as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22 and 25 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,734,987 to Cleveland, hereafter Cleveland.

This rejection is moot since claims 11 and 23 are now allowable for the reasons set forth above and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 12 and 24 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Karasawa as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22 and 25 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,840,369 to Takahashi et al., hereafter Takahashi.

This rejection is moot since claims 12 and 24 are now allowable for the reasons set forth above and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 2-12 and 15-24 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and passed to issue. If this amendment is deemed to not place the application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 12-11-03



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500